

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.Q. Box 1450 Aldrandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

m

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/721,493	11/25/2003	Manfred Rimkus	09038-US	09038-US 6046	
30689 DEERE & COI	30689 7590 03/29/2007 DEERE & COMPANY		EXAMINER		
ONE JOHN DEERE PLACE			HAMO, PATRICK		
MOLINE, IL 61265			· ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	- 50-		3746		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/29/2007	PAPER		

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/721,493	RIMKUS ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Patrick Hamo	3746			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	<u> </u>	correspondence address			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D/ - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 Fe</u>	ebruary 2007.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims		·			
<u> </u>	nlication	•			
<ul> <li>4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5,9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> </ul>					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,9 and 10</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
··· <u> </u>					
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examine</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 February 2007</u> is/are</li> </ul>		d to by the Evaminer			
	, , , , , ,	•			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).			
a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.				
<ul><li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li><li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage</li></ul>					
application from the International Bureau	·	in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ed.			
•					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/721,493

Art Unit: 3746

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to amendments filed on February 19, 2007.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano et al., 5,867,996 in view of Suzuki et al., 6,742,350.

Takano discloses a compressor control device including an engine 1, a motor 9 with a motor controller 18, a gearbox (the combination of 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 10), connected on its output side to a compressor 4 for compressing and discharging air and on its input side to the motor and engine, and sensors 20-22 and 26 for measuring the temperature of the air to be heated or cooled, sensor 24 measuring the vehicle velocity, the sensors inputting to electrical control unit 15 which outputs to the motor controller, and a further temperature setting input 23 for setting a target temperature. As noted in the previous action, in regards to the claimed limitation that the rotational speed of the drive engine can be varied, it is inherent that the engine cannot rotate forever, and that it can therefore be varied at least between on and off speeds.

Takano does not disclose the following claimed limitations: the drive arrangement further includes at least one sensor for the measurement of the rotational speed of the drive engine, wherein the conveying performance of the conveying device can be controlled or regulated by controlling the auxiliary motor as a function of at least one magnitude of the condition of the medium and the rotational speed of the drive engine.

Application/Control Number: 10/721,493

Art Unit: 3746

However, Suzuki teaches a hybrid compressor device with a compressor 130 driven by both an engine 10 and a motor 120, and an engine rotation speed sensor feeding into the control unit 160 (see fig. 1), whereby the operation of the motor is controlled by the control unit as a function of an air conditioning requirement signal, an engine speed rotational signal, and an evaporator temperature sensor (col. 6, II. 28-49) so that the production cost and size of the compressor can be reduced and that a cooling function can be ensured even when the vehicle engine is stopped (Abstract, II. 9-12).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the compressor control device of Takano with the control unit of Suzuki so that a cooling function can be ensured even the vehicle engine is stopped.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above in view of Sakai et al., 6,234,769.

The references as applied to claim 1 above teach all the limitations substantially as claimed except for the following: the summing gearbox is a planetary summing gearbox, wherein the drive engine is connected with an internal gear, the auxiliary motor is connected with a sun gear and the conveying device is connected with a planet carrier of the planetary summing gearbox.

Sakai teaches a hybrid compressor driven by an engine and a motor 100 (column 9, lines 11-15), a planetary gearbox 640 connected on its output side to a compressor 610 and on its input side to the motor and engine (see figure 8), the engine

Application/Control Number: 10/721,493

Art Unit: 3746

and motor connected to the sun gear and the compressor connected to the planet gears (see figures 8 and 10), and a one-way clutch so that the rotational driving force generated by the engine or motor is not transmitted from a shaft to a rotor and hence, the impact vibration is reduced (Abstract, II. 1-9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the references as applied to claim 1 above with the engine/motor driven compressor of Sakai to reduce impact vibrations.

In regards to the claimed limitation that the drive engine connected to the internal gear, the auxiliary motor connected to the sun gear, and the compressor connected with a planet carrier of the planetary gearbox, this is a mere rearrangement of parts with respect to the invention of Sakai et al., and would not have substantially modified the operation of the device. Therefore, these limitations are held unpatentable. See MPEP §2144.04(6)(c).

Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above in view of Crook et al., 5,628,234.

The references as applied to claim 1 above teach all the limitations substantially as claimed except for the following: that a gear ratio stage is arranged between the drive engine and the drive engine side input of the summing gearbox arranged for a gear ratio increase or reduction or a reversal of the direction of rotation of the drive, and that a free-wheeling device is arranged between the auxiliary motor and the summing gearbox which absorbs torque applied to the auxiliary motor.

However, Crook teaches a torque limiter in the form of a clutch 106, interposed between a motor 100 and shaft 20 that leads to a transmission (see figure 1), in order to protect the motor from a variety of fail conditions by disengaging the clutch (column 2, lines 50-59) and a gear ratio stage 110 between the motor 100 and transmission (see figure 1) that allows for gear reduction and reversal (column 2, lines 35-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the references as applied to claim 1 above with the toque-limiting clutch of Crook to protect the motor (column 2, lines 50-59).

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by applicants' amendment.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Hamo whose telephone number is 571-272-3492. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Stashick can be reached on 571-272-4561. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FU

PH

03222007

ANTHONY D. STASHICK SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700